

said that the period 400 to 600 would seem a major part that would be one interpretation. Then you just said, the rise of Islam and then           . Would you distinguish between what you            interpreting for the interpretation of the stone, and the interpretation for the second half of the Roman empire? Because I think that was a little problem.

No, the second half of ~~the~~ the Roman empire--- the second phase of it rather, is a period described by the iron and the clay being mixed. And that could well fit the condition from 400 to 600 A.D. So that would be what the second phase would represent.

The question wasn't about the stone; it was about the second phase. But then I said, give reasons for and against. The reasons for it, would be that it fits the description ~~very~~ very well in general. The reasons against it would be that it does not completely fit it because there was no strength in the Roman empire at that time, and because that peculiar phrase "mingling themselves with the seed of men"--- I don't know anything that fulfilled it then that you could not say was present in all periods.

But more importantly, because it was not followed by the coming of the stone. You see, we're discussing--what it is, we don't think it's then because nothing came immediately after which could be the coming of the stone.

In the other question we were discussing what is the stone, and the question of when it comes enters to some extent.

Mr. Martin: Still in our discussion, the question came up later in class and you took another ~~class~~ class, at the beginning of another class, and you said why could not the continuation of the Roman papacy, Roman church            and you presented that as another possibility of the second phase of the fourth kingdom.

Very good. What I just referred to would be the simple answer to the question. But there are two additional things that might have been said. We You were not required, but it would have been good if said.

One was, that the critics say it fits the latter part of the time of the Seleucids; the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It would in many ways fit that. But that's the third ~~kingdom~~ kingdom rather than the fourth. So that is not a satisfactory answer, but very good if you happen to think of it and mention it as a possibility, so long as you mention the main possibility of 400 to 600 A.D.

The other thing is that the second phase, if it isn't 400 to 600, it is either something future or you might say it starts at 400 and reaches right on to the very end. Either way would be perfectly alright.

Next question, number three. Briefly state whether the statue represents four kingdoms or five. As you look at ch. 2 you cannot tell if it represents four kingdoms or five. That is to say, there is a difference between the last two parts of ch. 2. So it could be five kingdoms. But they both have iron in them, so it could be four kingdoms. So as far as ch. 2 is concerned, you could not tell whether it is four kingdoms or five. But when you take ch. 7 into account, there you have only four beasts and not five. And the fourth beast is destroyed, just as the fifth part of ch. 2, is destroyed.